



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,491	09/23/2003	Robert Sheffield	57983.000131	1242
21967	7590	10/21/2008	EXAMINER	
HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 1900 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109			VAN, LUAN V	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1795		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		10/21/2008		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/667,491	SHEFFIELD ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	LUAN V. VAN	1795

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 September 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2,4-6,19 and 20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-6, 19 and 20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant's amendment of September 22, 2008 does not render the application allowable. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 19 and 20 are pending in the application.

Status of Objections and Rejections

All rejections from the previous office action are maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Tanaka et al. (US patent 4959507).

Regarding claim 1, Tanaka et al. teach a method for forming a bonded ceramic-metal composite substrate, the method comprising the step of: providing a layer of the circuit board 1 having the conductive circuit trace 2 (figure 1) on a surface thereof; and reducing a surface roughness (column 2 lines 23-35) of at least one surface of the conductive circuit trace on the surface of the circuit board layer. The method of Tanaka et al. would inherently improve the performance of a signal transmitted via the conductive circuit trace, since the surface roughness of the copper element 2 is reduced. Furthermore, Tanaka et al. teach that the median surface roughness of the copper circuit sheet be not greater than 1 µm, or equivalent to about 254 microinches,

Art Unit: 1795

and a maximum surface roughness be not greater than 8 μm , or equivalent to about 387 microinches (column 3 lines 9-12).

Tanaka et al. differ from the instant claim in that the reference does not explicitly teach the narrower range of roughness of the instant claim.

However, the range of roughness of Tanaka et al. (a surface roughness of no more than 254 microinches) encompasses the range of roughness of the instant claim (a surface roughness of no more than 20 microinches). Therefore, this encompassing range of roughness of Tanaka et al. is *prima facie* obviousness over the range of the instant claim. According to MPEP 2144.05, "[A] prior art reference that discloses a range encompassing a somewhat narrower claimed range is sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness." *In re Peterson*, 315 F.3d 1325, 1330, 65 USPQ2d 1379, 1382-83 (Fed. Cir. 2003). >See also *In re Harris*, 409 F.3d 1339, 74 USPQ2d 1951 (Fed. Cir. 2005).

Regarding claim 2, Tanaka et al. teach wherein the step of reducing the surface roughness includes mechanical polishing the at least one surface (column 4 lines 59-64).

Regarding claims 4-5, the ground of rejection of the instant claims parallel that given above in claim 1.

Regarding claim 6, Tanaka et al. teach wherein the at least one surface of the conductive circuit trace includes one of a group consisting of: a surface parallel and distal to a surface of the circuit board; a surface parallel and proximal to the surface of

Art Unit: 1795

the circuit board; and a surface perpendicular to the surface of the circuit board (figure 1).

Regarding claim 19, Tanaka et al. teach wherein the conductive circuit trace is formed on the surface of the circuit board layer 1 (figure 1).

Regarding claim 20, Tanaka et al. teach wherein the conductive circuit trace 2 is bonded (i.e., affixed, column 3 lines 56-60) to the surface of the circuit board layer 1.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. (US patent 4959507) in view of Nagai et al. (US pub 2002/0155021).

Regarding claim 1, Tanaka et al. teach a method for forming a bonded ceramic-metal composite substrate, the method comprising the step of: providing a layer of the circuit board 1 having the conductive circuit trace 2 (figure 1) on a surface thereof; and reducing a surface roughness (column 2 lines 23-35) of at least one surface of the conductive circuit trace on the surface of the circuit board layer. The method of Tanaka et al. would improve performance of a signal transmitted via the conductive circuit trace, since the surface roughness of the copper element 2 is reduced. Furthermore, Tanaka et al. teach that the median surface roughness of the copper circuit sheet be not greater than 1 μm , or equivalent to about 254 microinches, and a maximum surface roughness be not greater than 8 μm , or equivalent to about 387 microinches (column 3 lines 9-12).

Tanaka et al. differ from the instant claim in that the reference does not explicitly teach the narrower roughness range of the instant claim.

Art Unit: 1795

Nagai et al. teach "Large surface roughness of a copper foil results in the skin effect such that the current of electric signal having 1 GHz or more of frequency locally flows only on the surface of a coil. As a result, the impedance increases and the transmission of high-frequency signals is seriously influenced. Fine surface roughness is, therefore, necessary for conductive material used in a high-frequency circuit. The present inventors examined the relationship between the surface roughness and the high-frequency performance and discovered that 2 micrometer or less of surface roughness [or equivalent to about 97 microinches] in terms of the terms of the ten-point average surface-roughness (Rz) attains the desired high-frequency performance. The fine roughness can be provided by means of producing a wrought copper foil or electro-deposited copper foil under appropriate conditions, or chemically or electrolytically polishing the surface of a copper foil" (paragraph 28).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a smaller surface roughness in the copper sheet of Tanaka et al., because a smaller surface roughness would improve the high-frequency performance of the device by reducing the impedance, as taught by Nagai et al. (paragraph 28).

Regarding claim 2, Tanaka et al. teach wherein the step of reducing the surface roughness includes mechanical polishing the at least one surface (column 4 lines 59-64).

Regarding claims 4-5, the ground of rejection of the instant claims parallel that given above in claim 1.

Regarding claim 6, Tanaka et al. teach wherein the at least one surface of the conductive circuit trace includes one of a group consisting of: a surface parallel and distal to a surface of the circuit board; a surface parallel and proximal to the surface of the circuit board; and a surface perpendicular to the surface of the circuit board (figure 1).

Regarding claim 19, Tanaka et al. teach wherein the conductive circuit trace is formed on the surface of the circuit board layer 1 (figure 1).

Regarding claim 20, Tanaka et al. teach wherein the conductive circuit trace 2 is bonded (i.e., affixed, column 3 lines 56-60) to the surface of the circuit board layer 1.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In the arguments presented on page 7-8 of the amendment, the applicant argues that the range of roughness of Tanaka is not narrower than that of the instant claim based on the examiner's statement of the difference, in the previous office action and provided above, that Tanaka "differs from the instant claims in that the reference does **not** explicitly teach the narrower range of roughness of the instant claim." It appears that the applicant is misinterpreting the statement. The examiner indeed agrees with the applicant's statement that Tanaka's range of roughness is larger than that of the instant claim. Simply restated, Tanaka's range of roughness is 0-254 microinches, and the applicant's range of roughness is 0-20 microinches; therefore, the applicant's range of roughness falls within Tanaka's range of roughness. Since

Art Unit: 1795

Tanaka's range of roughness covers the applicant's range of roughness, Tanaka's range of roughness "encompasses" that of the applicant's. The examiner believes that he has met the requirement for a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Luan V. Van whose telephone number is 571-272-8521. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1795

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Nam X Nguyen/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1753

LVV
October 20, 2008